

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Thirteen (13) claims (Claims 1-13) remain pending in the application through this Amendment. Claim 4 has been amended herein to correct an informality noted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests further examination of the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 5-13 would be allowable but for dependency from a rejected base claim, and that claim 4 would be allowable but for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner states that the term "each configuration register" lacks sufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claim 4 to correct this informality and believes that the amendment overcomes the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) – Chen et al.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,901,230 to Chen, et al. (hereinafter *Chen*). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that *Chen* discloses shared registers in which each register has one or more bits defining an access protocol and one or more bits representing data. In Fig. 2, *Chen* discloses shared registers 200 and semaphore registers 160. Nowhere does *Chen* disclose or suggest that, within a given one of those shared registers 200, some of the bits represent data and other bits (of that same register) define an access protocol. If anything, *Chen* discloses that the semaphore registers 160 are used to control access to the

shared registers 200: “Access to any one of the three clusters of shared registers 200 is normally controlled solely by CPU software, utilizing semaphore registers to coordinate the same between processors” (*Chen*, col. 8, lines 44-46.) In other words, the bits that control access to the data bits are in a different register than the data bits themselves. As recited in Applicant’s claims, “each register includ[es] one or more bits defining an access protocol, and one or more bits representing data.”

As claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, and by dependency incorporate the subject matter discussed above, Applicant’s remarks above also apply to claims 2-3. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3 are not anticipated by *Chen* and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all grounds of rejection have been overcome and/or successfully traversed, and accordingly that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Should there be any further questions or concerns, the Examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned to expedite examination.

Respectfully submitted,
GARDNER GROFF SANTOS
& GREENWALD, P.C.

/Lawrence D. Maxwell/
Lawrence D. Maxwell, Reg. No. 35,276

GARDNER GROFF SANTOS
& GREENWALD, P.C.
2018 Powers Ferry Road, Suite 800
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
Phone: 770.984.2300
Fax: 770.984.0098